



# WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION **DRAFT** Meeting Minutes

## Planning Commission Members

Sarah Chvilicek, Vice Chair

Francine Donshick, Chair

R. Michael Flick

Daniel Lazzareschi

Kate S. Nelson

Rob Pierce

Patricia Phillips

## Secretary

Trevor Lloyd

Tuesday, February 7, 2023

6:00 p.m.

Washoe County Administrative Complex  
Commission Chambers  
1001 E 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Building A  
Reno, Nevada 89512

and available via  
**Zoom Webinar**

---

The Washoe County Planning Commission met in a scheduled session on Tuesday, February 7, 2023, in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada and via Zoom teleconference.

The meeting will be televised live and replayed on the Washoe Channel at: <https://www.washoecounty.us/mgrsoff/Communications/wctv-live.php> also on YouTube at: <https://www.youtube.com/user/WashoeCountyTV>

---

## 1. \*Determination of Quorum

Chair Donshick called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The following Commissioners and staff were present:

Commissioners present: Sarah Chvilicek, Vice Chair  
Francine Donshick, Chair  
Daniel Lazzareschi  
Kate S. Nelson  
Rob Pierce  
Pat Phillips

Commissioners absent: R. Michael Flick

Staff present: Trevor Lloyd, Secretary, Planning and Building  
Katherine Oakley, Planner, Planning and Building  
Jennifer Gustafson, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office  
Adriana Albarran, Office Support Specialist, Planning and Building  
Brandon Roman, Recording Secretary, Planning and Building

## 2. Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Lazzareschi led the pledge to the flag.

## 3. Ethics Law Announcement

Deputy District Attorney Gustafson provided the ethics procedure for disclosures.

## 4. Appeal Procedure

Secretary Lloyd recited the appeal procedure for items heard before the Planning

Commission.

## 5. General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof

Chair Donshick opened the Public Comment period. There were no requests for public comment. Chair Donshick closed the Public Comment period.

## 6. Approval of February 7, 2023 Agenda

Commissioner Nelson moved to approve the agenda for the February 7, 2023, meeting as written. Commissioner Pierce seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of six for, and none against. Commissioner Flick was absent.

## 7. Approval of January 3, 2023 Draft Minutes

Secretary Roman noted there were corrections made to the motions to reflect the motion makers. Commissioner Phillips moved to approve the minutes for the January 3, 2023, Planning Commission meeting as corrected. Commissioner Pierce seconded the motion to approve the minutes as corrected, which passed unanimously with a vote of six for, and none against. Commissioner Flick was absent.

## 8. Public Hearings

**A. Master Plan Amendment and Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WMPA22-0007 & WRZA22-0008 (395 North) [For possible action]** – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to:

(1) Approve an amendment to the Cold Springs Area Plan, a component of the Washoe County Master Plan, to redesignate one parcel totaling 2,500 square feet ( $\pm 0.05$  acres) from Suburban Residential (SR) to Industrial (I); and

(2) Initiate and recommend adoption of an amendment to the Cold Springs Regulatory Zone Map, to redesignate one parcel totaling 2,500 square feet ( $\pm 0.05$  acres) from Public/Semi-Public Facilities (PSP) to Industrial (I). The regulatory zone amendment is subject to final approval by the Board of County Commissioners of the associated master plan amendment and a finding of conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan by regional planning authorities.

(3) And, if approved, authorize the chair to sign resolutions to this effect.

- Applicant: Panattoni Development
- Property Owner: Great Basin Water Company
- Location: 0 Reno Park Blvd
- APN: 081-121-35
- Parcel Size: 2,500 sf
- Existing Master Plan: Suburban Residential (SR)
- Proposed Master Plan: Industrial (I)
- Existing Regulatory Zone: Public/Semi-Public Facilities (PSP)
- Proposed Regulatory Zone: Industrial (I)
- Area Plan: Cold Springs (CS)
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 820, Amendment of Master Plan and Article 821, Amendment of Regulatory Zone
- Commission District: 5 – Commissioner Herman
- E-mail: koakley@washoecounty.gov

Planner Oakley provided a presentation. Applicant/Representative/Consultant John Krmpotic provided a presentation.

Public Comment:

Carolyn Nay said "I am a resident that's adjacent to the proposed well. I have a couple of questions. I understand that it's being changed to industrial, and then it is separate from Truckee Meadows Water. I did not see the area where the new well will support in the immediate future. There was a discussion of minimal traffic impacts. South Reno Park Boulevard is a very rough road. It's not paved. Are there going to be some impacts on that? I'm not sure if there will be drilling or trucks coming down or what that level of construction might be, so that's another question. The other question is the size of the well? My only concern there would be any visual impact on the views. My view would be West over South Reno Park Boulevard. Is anyone able to address those questions?"

Chair Donshick informed Ms. Nay the commission doesn't respond to public comments. Secretary Lloyd told Ms. Nay her public comment was three minutes to provide testimony; it was not time for question or answer, but the board may ask the staff questions, if appropriate. Ms. Nay continued by stating, "In summary, what area would the new well support immediately and in the future? The second question concerns the traffic impact on South Reno Park Boulevard, a very unstructured, rough road. So there's been no talk about what's involved in construction and trucks and things like that coming up and then also, how big is the water tank?"

Discussion by Commission:

Vice-Chair Chvilicek asked Planner Oakley if the relocation was not under their consideration that evening.

Planner Oakley confirmed it was not.

Commissioner Lazzareschi asked if they had a record of a plug and abandon of that existing well?

Ms. Oakley said that was not included in the application. The applicant may have a record of that or the owners might know that.

Commissioner Lazzareschi asked if there would be any construction permits or something of that nature, a plug and abandoned record on file and if that was presumably a requirement of Planning.

Ms. Oakley confirmed that was correct.

**MOTION FOR MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT: Commissioner Chvilicek moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commission adopt the resolution contained at Exhibit A of this staff report to amend the Master Plan as set forth in Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA22-0007, having made all five findings included in Washoe County Code Section 110.820.15(d) and having found that the amendment is in conformance with Cold Springs Area Plan Policies CS.14.1 and 14.3.1. Commissioner Chvilicek further moved to certify the resolution and proposed Master Plan Amendment in WMPA22-007 as set forth in the staff report and for submission to the Washoe County Board of Commissioners and authorize the chair to sign the resolution on behalf of the Planning Commissioners.**

**Commissioner Pierce seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of six for, and none against. Commissioner Flick was absent.**

**MOTION FOR REGULATORY ZONE AMENDMENT: Commissioner Lazzareschi moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning**

Commission adopt the resolution included as Exhibit B recommended adoption of regulatory zone amended case number WRZA22-0008, having made all the findings included in the Washoe County code section 110.821.15(d). Commissioner Lazzerschi further moved to certify the resolution and the proposed regulatory zone amendment WRZA22-0008 as set forth in the staff report for submission to the Washoe County board commissioners and authorized the chair to sign the resolution on behalf of the Washoe County Planning Commission.

Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of six for, and none against. Commissioner Flick was absent.

**B. Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP22-0037 (Praana Solar) – [For possible action]** – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve a special use permit for 1) the establishment of a 65MW photovoltaic generation facility and a 125MW battery energy storage system which is an Energy Production, Renewable use; 2) construction of a 345 kV sub-station and a 5-mile 345 kV Gen-tie line connecting the proposed substation to the Fort Sage Substation, which is a Utility Services use; 3) major grading for 22.5 acres of ground disturbance and 40,000 cy of fill, 4) a request to vary all parking design requirements of WCC 110.410.25, and 5) a request to vary the maximum height of 35' to allow for structures of 150' in height. This project meets the standard for a project of regional significance because it will generate more than 5 MW of electricity, require construction of a substation, and require construction of a transmission line that carries 60 kV or more. It will require approval by the regional planning authorities before any approval at the county level would take effect. The substation will be located on APN 074-470-05. This project also requires recommendation to amend to the Regional Utility Corridor Map from the Board of County Commissioners to identify the location of the new substation and transmission line. This project will need to comply with all Federal and State approvals before any approval at the county level would take effect.

- Applicant: Praana Renewables Energy, LLC
- Property Owner: Hooper Family Trust
- Location: 5 miles west of Flannigan, intersection of Rainbow Road and Calveda Way
- Photovoltaic Facility APN: 074-470-02, 03, 04, 05
- Substation and Gen-tie APN: 074-470-05, 06, 08, 13, 16, 11, 12; 074-082-13, 12, 06, 05; 074-051-03, 11, 14, 17; 074-061-05, 06, 18, 19, 40; 074-062-38, 39, 54, 55, 06, 07, 22, 23; 074-040-61, 60
- Photovoltaic Facility Parcel Size: 26.05, 116.22, 17.632, 119.02 acres
- Master Plan: Rural
- Regulatory Zone: General Rural (GR)
- Area Plan: High Desert
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 810, Special Use Permits
- Commission District: 5 – Commissioner Herman
- Staff: NAME, Planner  
Washoe County Community Services Department  
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.3628
- E-mail: [koakley@washoecounty.gov](mailto:koakley@washoecounty.gov)

Planner Oakley provided a presentation.

There were no requests for public comment.

Commissioner Phillips asked if the transmission lines are included within this proposal.

Ms. Oakley said they were only making a decision on the solar facility, the battery storage, the substation, and the grading and it had no bearing on a decision on a transmission line in the future.

Commissioner Phillips stated the second part of her question was that they will not be doing any of this work during certain times of the year.

Ms. Oakley said there are no conditions of approval for this area for seasonal restrictions on construction because none were recommended by the Nevada Department of Wildlife. If Commissioner Phillips saw it in the agency comments, it was likely related to a discussion of the transmission line, which was not under consideration.

Commissioner Lazzareschi asked if there had been an identification of the chemistry of the lithium-ion battery that will be used.

The applicant representative, Brent Moore, said they would have to look at several different chemistries. They've addressed those environmental impact reports, both in the State of California and with the Public Utility Commission of Nevada. He believed they've considered three alternatives for batteries. Each one had its own fire hazards and peculiar way of putting them out. All three they've looked at require no water to be put on them if they overcharge. If they overcharge and water is thrown on them, they will explode and create more gas. So they have to be put out with fire suppression systems.

Commissioner Lazzareschi asked if the duration of the storage was considered.

Mr. Moore said the duration they're proposing is because of the NV Energy requirements to go a maximum of 125 megawatts. So when the batteries discharge out, it's four times that. Twenty-five times four would be 100 megawatts and could be dispersed over four hours of discharging.

Commissioner Lazzareschi asked Mr. Moore if they actually needed the 150 foot height limit on the substation.

Mr. Moore, said no, it's one of those issues where they want their engineers to have flexibility. Mr. Moore went on to say that Fort Sage gets congested, and they have Next Era, who has put up towers to convey their interconnection. They've got Alturas Inter Tie Line, which has a 345 KV transmission line that comes into Fort Sage, so they all create some obstacles. Their bus is on the backside of Fort Sage. So what they want is to give the engineers some flexibility; if they want to go over the top, they got to keep a certain separation from the existing conductors. If they want to go under, then that's a whole other issue or matter with engineering and the resistivity of the soils there. So They're just trying to give them as many options as possible. But typically, the poles are 75 feet tall on the Gen Tie line. But when they get down to Fort Sage they are about 60-foot-high systems. They need to have a little higher to get above that. In addition, 150 feet was because they were also looking at maybe some weather stations. But that site is mirrored on the California side. They have options. For example, they could put the substation on the California side. They could put the transmission Gen Tie lines on the California side. They could put all the meteorological data and towers on the California side. It depends on how they want to do the final site. What kind of data they're trying to collect, and how important it is to have 2,000 feet of difference with meteorological data. It may not make any difference when they start looking at the final site characteristics.

Commissioner Lazzareschi asked if they're selling this power to California, is there a reason they wanted the substation and Gen Tie line on the Nevada side.

Mr. Moore, responded that it was a direct shot into NV Energy. NV Energy is the substation of choice where power can be distributed either way. It can go to California, and it can go to Nevada. NV Energy is preparing the Green Tie line to convey renewable energy to the State of California for sale. So, depending on which state is being talked about, the tie line between Northern Nevada and Southern Nevada was between two and four years away. Mr. Moore continued by saying, the Fort Sage substation had a lot of capacity. They got the last bus on that with our interconnection. The Cal ISO was being thought about to run Nevada as well. Currently the Cal ISO was contracted with Arizona, but it was looking to contract with Oregon and Washington. Mr. Moore finished by stating, whether it was in California or Nevada might not make a difference in one more year, if Cal ISO was going to be the independent system operator for all the WIC, was yet to be determined.

Commissioner Lazzareschi asked Mr. Moore, given the 150 feet was about the tie line that was not before the commission that evening, what actual height would they request for the substation.

Mr. Moore, said that for the substation, He thought the highest portion will probably not exceed 90 feet. So, between 75 and 90 feet.

There were no requests for public comment.

DDA Gustafson said she would recommend they look at page two on their staff report, the only thing that needs to be added would be the grading aspect. If they just add the word grading for a motion in the affirmative, that would be her recommendation. The motion didn't include Gen Tie lines.

Commissioner Lazzareschi said he would like to propose the motion with the amendment that the commission limit the substation height to 100 feet, which was more than what the applicant had asked for, but would take out the extra height that would have applied to the inner tie line that is not before the commission that night.

**MOTION: Commissioner Lazzareschi moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commissioner approve with conditions Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP22-0037 for Praana Renewables Energy, LLC, for the photovoltaic generation facility, 125 battery energy storage system and substation with a height limitation of 100 feet and grading only, with the conditions included as Exhibit A to this matter, having made all five findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.810.30 and the additional development of natural resources findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.810.35. I further wave the development code standards in WCC 110.410.25(a) and (c) through (g) and vary the development code and standards in table 110.406.05.1 to allow structures up to 100 feet in height.**

**Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion which passed unanimously with a vote of six for, and none against. Commissioner Flick was absent.**

Discussion:

Vice-Chair Chvilicek asked if changing height creates an unintended burden on the developer because the language is permissive, stating it 'may reach up to 150,' but it may not.

Mr. Moore with Sierra Geotech, said the 100 feet is fine. They were only really concerned with when they got down to Fort Sage Substation. They had to finalize their plans and go back and look at the National Code for Electrical Safety. Mr. Moore finished by saying 100 feet might be fine there too, but they won't have to address that until they go back and approve the Gen Tie line.

**The motion passed unanimously with a vote of six for, and none against. Commissioner Flick was absent.**

## **9. Chair and Commission Items**

### A. Future agenda items

Secretary Lloyd noted Planning would be bringing back a status update on the Master Plan Envision Washoe 2040 next month.

### B. Requests for information from staff

None

## **10. Director's and Legal Counsel's Items**

### A. Report on previous Planning Commission items

Secretary Lloyd relayed all the items that happened at the January 17 Board of County Commission (BCC) Meeting: First was the Village Green Master Plan Amendments for the Specific Plan. The BCC affirmed the decision of the Planning Commission and adopted the Master Plan. Also, the County Commission affirmed the Planning Commission's denial of the code amendment regarding the Cannabis Consumption Lounges. Finally, the BCC adopted the code amendment to Article 220, which was the Tahoe Code Amendment to allow single-family residences in the Special Area One of Incline Village.

### B. Legal information and updates

None

## **11. \*General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof**

There were no requests for public comment.

## **12. Adjournment**

With no further business scheduled before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 6:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Misty Moga, Independent Contractor.

Approved by Commission in session on February 7, 2023

---

Trevor Lloyd  
Secretary to the Planning Commission